



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/717,199

11/18/2003

Robert M. Perego

70205/11:1

6247

3528

7590

05/24/2006

STOEL RIVES LLP
900 SW FIFTH AVENUE
SUITE 2600
PORTLAND, OR 97204-1268

EXAMINER

KO, DANIEL BOKMIN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2189

DATE MAILED: 05/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/717,199	PEREGO, ROBERT M.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Reginald G. Bragdon	2189	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Reginald G. Bragdon.

(3) Robert Perego.

(2) Daniel Ko.

(4) Micah Stolowitz (#32,758).

Date of Interview: 18 May 2006.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.


Identification of prior art discussed: Crockett et al. and Tzelnic et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed how Crockett et al. teaches volume migration as opposed to data set level migration as set forth in the claims. Also discussed aspects of the claimed invention related to changes made in source data set allocation since initial assessment (step K of original claim 1). The examiner requested a detailed discussion of the differences in the response to the first office action.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


REGINALD G. BRAGDON
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required